



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

M-L

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/028,309	12/28/2001	Steven Holliday	52493.000145	2885

21967 7590 12/31/2007
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
1900 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TAN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3629

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/31/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/028,309	Applicant(s) HOLLIDAY ET AL.	
	Examiner Tan Dean D. Nguyen	Art Unit 3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/10/07 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

The amendment of 9/10/07 has been entered. Independent claims 1, 7, 10, 43 and 49 have been amended. Claims 1-53 are pending and are rejected as followed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. The term "a delivery solutions processor or module" as shown in Figs. 2, element 100

4. Claims 1-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the

invention. The new limitation "a delivery solutions processor or module" as shown in Figs. 2, element 100, pages 4-5, are not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. What are the names of the processor or modules or what programs they consist of?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. Claims 1-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claims 1-53, the term "B2B", "B2P", "B2C", etc. are vague and indefinite. They are not conventional terms and could change with time, place, and environment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claims 1-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (1) ADLER in view of (2) MORGAN et al or vice versa and further in view of (3) MARPE et al.

As of 9/10/07, claim 1 is as followed:

1. (Amended) A process for evaluating a business entity's success in developing new business, comprising the steps of:

(a) developing a strategy and a plan to support at least one of the business entity's high level objectives in a component of the business entity, wherein the strategy and plan are developed via a delivery solutions processor or module;

(b) establishing a relationship between the component of the business entity and an agent or broker using the developed plan, wherein the relationship between the component of the business entity and the agent or broker is established via a B2B dashboard associated with the delivery solutions processor or module;

(c) establishing a relationship between the component of the business entity and a producer using the developed plan, wherein the relationship between the component of the business entity and the producer is established via a B2P dashboard associated with the delivery solutions processor or module;

(d) establishing a relationship between the component of the business entity and a consumer using the developed plan, wherein the relationship between the component of the business entity and the consumer is established via a B2C dashboard associated with the delivery solutions processor or module; and

(e) processing new business resulting from the established relationships, wherein the new business is monitored via a new business dashboard associated with the delivery solutions processor or module.

Similarly, **ADLER** fairly teaches a process for evaluating a business entity objective in developing new business (merger and acquisition), comprising the steps of:

(a) developing a strategy and a plan to support at least one of the business entity's high level objectives in a component of the business entity {see [0002], [0004], [0107]};

(b) establishing a relationship between the modified business entity and an intermediary or "middlemen" using the developed plan {see [0019], [0021]};

(c) establishing a relationship between the modified business entity and a producer using the developed plan {see [0025]};

(d) establishing a relationship between the modified business entity and a consumer using the developed plan {see Fig. 5, 5A, Fig. 9}; and

(e) processing new business resulting from the established relationships {see Fig. 1A, 15, [0002], [0006]}.

Note that **ADLER** teaches the analysis of the strategic business decisions for different scenarios such as merger and acquisition of business entities. Note that the terms such as "agent or broker" or "intermediary" or "producer" is considered as "non-functional descriptive material" and has no patentable weight. It merely represents a second entity with a function of "producing something" or serving as "agent or broker".

However, the functions are not positively claimed and thus the term has no patentable weight. Moreover, as shown on [0019], ADLER indicates that "intermediary" and "agent" or "broker" are basically the same or interchangeable or read over each other since they act like a "third party" between the "business entity" and the "customer/consumer", based on how the business is carried out such as on-line (B2B) or off-line (conventional or manually). Also, from the "Background of the invention", it appears that "intermediary" serves the same function as "agents or broker" or reads over "agent" or "broker". Therefore, ADLER fairly teaches the claimed invention except for explicitly teaches the carrying out steps (b)-(e) using a component or business unit of the business entity.

In a similar business environment for analyzing business decision (achieve business objectives) for various business scenarios, i.e. trends, forecast, benchmark, site comparison, configuration changes, problem resolution, {see col. 4, lines 1-27, Fig. 1, 50}, **MORGAN et al** fairly teaches the establishing various relations between the most basic functions of an organization/entity (component of a business entity or business unit) and well known business entities, i.e. intermediary, producer, and customer for determining/evaluating the business strategies and obtaining business results (cost) and wherein the strategy and plan are developed via processor or module {see Figs. 1, elements 12, 30, 18, Figs. 3, 5, 6 "Business Unit/org" (84) and 7, col. 5, lines 5-67, Table B on col. 9}. It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of ADLER to include the evaluation of a business unit, most basic function of an organization, as taught by MORGAN et al to inherently obtain more accurate evaluation.

Alternatively, MORGAN et al fairly teaches the claimed invention except for the relationship between the component of the business entity and the entity wherein the component is acquired by the business entity. The teaching of ADLER is cited above. It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of MORGAN et al by carrying out scenario of which the component is acquired by the business entity such as merger and acquisition as taught by ADLER above.

The teachings of ADLER and MORGAN et al teaches the claimed invention except for failing to teach the use of monitoring dashboard in functions in (b)-(e).

In a similar business environment for managing new business project (merger and acquisition), MARPE et al discloses the use of Dashboard, i.e. Executive Dashboard, associated with the current network system for providing interested parties a single checkpoint to understand (tracking and monitoring) the current state of the project or access key information in a quick and illustrated manner {see Figs. 9, 10, cols. 17-19}. It would have been obvious to modify the teachings of ADLER /MORGAN et al by using the monitoring dashboard associated with the current network system as taught by MARPE et al for providing interested parties a single checkpoint to understand (tracking and monitoring) the current state of the project or access key information in a quick and illustrated manner {see Figs. 9, 10, cols. 17-19}.

As for dep. claim 2 (part of 1 above), which deals with the type of the component of the business entity, a 2nd business acquired by the 1st business, this is taught in ADLER [0002], [0008]}.

As for dep. claims 3-4 (part of 1 above), which deals with well known parameters in establishing relationship with a consumer, i.e. targeting, establishing contact, and selling a product to the consumer, these are non-essential to the scope of the claimed invention and would have been obvious to a skilled artisan to include these well known steps for conducting business with a consumer, as taught by MORGAN et al on cols. 17-19.

As for dep. claims 5-6 (part of 1 above), which deals with business evaluating parameters, i.e. to access the success (promising strategy) using at least a well known business parameters/metrics, i.e. cost, timeliness, these are fairly taught in ADLER Fig. 1, (15), Fig. 1A (12) "Economic" or MORGAN et al Figs. 3-6.

As for independent system claim 7, which is basically the system to carry out the method of claim 1 above, it's rejected over the system of ADLER/MORGAN et al or vice versa/MARPE et al used for the rejection of method claim 1 above.

As for dep. claims 8-9 (part of 7 above), which have the same limitations as in dep. claims 6, 3 (part of 1 above), they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of dep. claims 6 and 3 above.

As for independent method² claim 10, which has the limitation of claims 1 and 3, it's rejected for the same reasons set forth in the combination of the rejections of claims 1 and 3 above.

As for dep. claims 11-42, (part of 10 above), which are merely well known parameters for business analyzing and implementing various business relationships, it would have been obvious to use these well known business parameters to carry out the

specific steps (a)-(d) as mere using well known business parameters or analysis.

These are fairly taught in MORGAN et al Figs. 1, 7, 8, Tables B, cols. 17-19.

As for independent system² claim 43, which is basically the system to carry out the independent method of claim 10 above, it's rejected over the system of ADLER/MORGAN et al or vice versa/MARPE et al used for the rejection of method claim 10 above.

As for dep. claims 44-48 (part of 43 above), which have the same limitations as in dep. claims 2-6 (part of 1 above), they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of dep. claims 2-6 above.

As for independent system³ claim 49, which is basically the system to carry out the independent method of claim 10 above, it's rejected over the system of ADLER/MORGAN et al or vice versa/MARPE et al used for the rejection of method claim 10 above.

As for dep. claims 50-53 (part of 49 above), which have the same limitations as in dep. claims 2-6 (part of 1 above), they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of dep. claims 2-6 above.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-53 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection which are caused by applicant's amendment of the claims.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1) US 2003/0097319 by Moldovan teaches method for determining business solution.

2) US 2002/0082882 by Perry et al, discloses a computerized method for evaluating and shaping business proposal.

3) US 2001/0034628, by Eder, discloses a detailed method and system for modeling and analyzing business improvement programs.

4) US 7,107,224 by Weller et al, discloses a value driven integrated build-to-buy decision analysis system and method.

5)US 2003/0249657 by Kol et al, teaches synergism realization for enterprise change.

No claims are allowed.

Application/Control Number:
10/028,309
Art Unit: 3629

Page 11

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct@uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).


In receiving an Office Action, it becomes apparent that certain documents are missing, e. g. copies of references, Forms PTO 1449, PTO-892, etc., requests for copies should be directed to Tech Center 3600 Customer Service at (571) 272-3600, or e-mail CustomerService3600@uspto.gov.

Any inquiry concerning the merits of the examination of the application should be directed to Dean Tan Nguyen at telephone number (571) 272-6806. My work schedule is normally Monday through Friday from 6:30 am - 4:00 pm. I am scheduled to be off every other Friday.

Should I be unavailable during my normal working hours, my supervisor John Weiss can be reached at (571) 272-6812.

The main FAX phone numbers for formal communications concerning this application are (571) 273-8300. My personal Fax is (571) 273-6806. Informal communications may be made, following a telephone call to the examiner, by an informal FAX number to be given.

dtn
December 26, 2007



DEAN T. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER